

# MEETING SUMMARY

## GOLDEN TRIANGLE REGULATORY IMPLEMENTATION

Date: September 17, 2019  
Meeting Info: September 12, 2019, 3:00-5:00 pm, Webb Building Room 4.F.6  
Subject: Advisory Committee Meeting #3

---

### Attendance

- **Advisory Committee**
  - Present: Kristy Bassuener, Chris Carvell, Pete Dikeou, Charlie Hunt, Scott Johnson, Rhonda Knop, Anne Lindsey, Laura Liska, Chris Parezo, Adam Perkins, Jeff Samet, Brent Snyder, Susan Stanton, Byron Zick
  - Not present: Chris Hinds (District 10), Cherry Rohe
- **Public**
  - n/a
- **City Staff**
  - CPD – Abe Barge, Lilly Djanians, Kristofer Johnson, Krystal Marquez, Josh Palmeri

### Meeting Summary

- **Confirmed previous meeting outcomes**
  - Explore using a suite of different building forms to better address Plan goals and respond to different contexts
  - Explore Use of Point Tower
    - OK to exceed current max height of 175 feet to offset mass limitations
    - Ensure this is not the only form allowed to avoid uninterrupted 5-story podium
    - Examine current floor plate limitations and how to ensure spacing on adjacent lots
  - FAR and Incentives
    - Including parking in FAR calculations may require increase in total FAR allowed
    - Evaluate and revise current premiums to better address current goals
    - Explore opportunities to expand TDR system to buildings beyond Landmark
  - Street level and pedestrian experience
    - Current Build-to range (0-5 feet) is too restrictive
    - Requirement for non-residential uses on the ground floor may lead to vacant storefronts (be cautious with this idea)
    - Tall street level floor-to-floor heights (14-16 feet) are important to define uses and allow for future conversion between residential/commercial
- **Reviewed building form options**
  - Reviewed potential building form framework
    - Form 1 – General (small lot) – fewer design requirements, high floor area potential, greatest flexibility to encourage development on smaller lots
    - Form 2 – General (large lot) – higher design requirements (especially massing) for larger projects, medium floor area potential
    - Form 3 – Point Tower – highest design requirements, but highest floor area potential in exchange

- Committee agreed to framework in principle and had the following comments on some of the details:
  - Width of 125' or less will be hard to execute parking. Consider increasing width threshold between small and large lots to 150'–175'
  - Other citywide incentives exist to promote small lot development (e.g., no on-site stormwater requirements, parking exemptions, etc.)
  - Consider how can we encourage several smaller towers rather than long continuous walls
  - Setting the upper story setback within a range in feet, rather than 5 stories, may provide additional flexibility and creative solutions
  - Upper story setback should only apply to a percentage and avoid a rigid 5-story streetwall everywhere
  - Should require (likely through DSG and design review) architectural details that wrap around corners and down alleys to avoid blank walls
  - Open space requirement – is this intended to define usable open space at the ground level or create articulation and breakdown of the building mass? These are two slightly different things and could result in different approaches.
    - Staff responded it is intended to achieve both.
  - Open space requirement should be carefully calibrated and located to consolidate these areas where they are appropriate (i.e., near areas identified in Plan vision like Acoma) and avoid small leftover spaces scattered through the neighborhood where they might attract undesired activity
- **Reviewed parking and FAR calculations**
  - In favor of including parking in FAR calculations, but need to consider what new maximums will be and how they accommodate parking
  - In favor of eliminating a minimum parking requirement
    - Eliminating allows greater flexibility for shared parking (i.e., residential sharing parking during the day with nearby offices)
    - Concentrate more on providing variety of transportation and mobility options rather than parking
    - Lender issue if you can't prove you have enough parking, it may still be an issue in Denver, while other cities are above the curve (don't want to set a parking maximum requirement yet that would impact lending opportunities)
    - Consider incentivizing the ability to convert parking floors (e.g., providing FAR bonus, or not counting parking if it is convertible)
- **Reviewed FAR incentives and TDR system**
  - Discussed whether market-rate residential housing was an appropriate incentive (more people work in the area than live, so it is possibly still important)
  - Potential for incentivizing for-sale products rather than rental (this could be difficult favoring one market type over another)
  - Potential to incentivize larger units or range of unit sizes (could be more feasible)
  - Affordable housing incentive should be increased from current premium
  - Need to consider how many incentives are available – i.e., the fewer we have, the more we can control outcomes and focus our efforts on priorities
  - Encouraging a stronger market for TDR is a good goal – current FAR premium system (especially for residential housing) does not support TDR
  - If Character buildings are established as an alternative, then need to observe them over time to ensure they are not demolished
  - If TDR is supported as a stronger tool, then better tracking and administration over time is important

- Conversation about preliminary maximums being proposed being lower than current FAR maximums (especially if parking is included)
  - Goal is not to lower development rights, but to make a better connection between larger developments and neighborhood goals
- **Next Steps**
  - Community Open House #2 – Wednesday, September 25, 5:00-7:00 pm, Denver Community Credit Union (1041 Acoma St, 3<sup>rd</sup> floor)
  - Advisory Committee Meeting #4 – Thursday, November 21, 3:00-5:00 pm, Webb Building Room 4.F.6

### **Action Items**

1. Staff to post meeting materials to website
2. Staff to send Committee survey to prioritize potential FAR incentives and summary of DSG process in follow-up email